

REMARKS

Claims 1-21 and 24-34 remain in the application. Claims 1 and 25 are amended. Claims 22 and 23 are canceled. No claim is added. Applicant respectfully requests for allowance of each of pending claims.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,697,103 to Fernandez et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Fernandez").

The independent claim 1, as amended, is directed to a mobile security system wherein ***“[a] server is implemented with a real time synchronization protocol for alerting a monitoring station when [a] digital video recorder is within a predetermined proximity of the monitoring station”*** (emphasis added). Support for such amendment can be found through out the specification, for example, paragraph [026] providing “[s]erver 150 further may include a real time synchronization protocol for alerting the monitoring station 180 when one of the plurality of digital video recorders 110 is proximate the station...”

Fernandez fails to teach, suggest or imply a server implemented with a real time synchronization protocol for alerting a monitoring station when the digital video recorder is within a predetermined proximity of the monitoring station.

On page 5 of the office action in rejecting original claims 22 and 23, the Examiner asserts “Fernandez discloses further comprising a monitoring station (Fernandez: column 10, lines 55-67; column 11, lines 1-6).” However, Applicant respectfully disagrees with such assertion. Fernandez teaches forwarding a relevant object location upon detection of emergency (col. 10, line 67: col. 11, line 3). This object location refers to the whereabouts of the object 2 that is being detected (FIG. 1), not to a mobile unit carrying a digital video recorder that detects, as in the claimed invention.

Moreover, Fernandez does not teach, suggest or imply “alerting a monitoring station when the digital video recorder is within a predetermined proximity of the monitoring station.” This is a crucial difference as the claimed invention concerns the proximity of a police patrol car with respect to a police station (see, paragraph [014]), whereas Fernandez is directed to a global positioning application that does not necessarily require the knowledge of the proximity between a mobile unit carrying a digital video recorder and a monitoring station (see, abstract). This alerting function facilitates dispatching police patrol cars, a need not recognized by Fernandez.

As such, Fernandez does not anticipate the claimed invention. For the same reasons discussed above, the independent claim 25 is also patentable over Fernandez under section 102. Accordingly, claims 2, 4, 6-21, 24 and 26-34 depending on claim 1 or 25, and including all the limitations set forth therein, are patentable over Fernandez under section 102 as well.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Fernandez.

Claim 3 depends on claim 1 and includes all the limitations set forth therein. As such, claim 3 is patentable over Fernandez under section 103.

CONCLUSION

Applicant has made an earnest attempt to place this application in an allowable form. In view of the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the pending claims are drawn to novel subject matters, patentably distinguishable over the prior art of record. The Examiner is therefore, respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the outstanding rejections.

Should the Examiner deem that any further clarification is desirable, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the below listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,



By: _____
Howard Chen, Esq.
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 46,615

Kirkpatrick & Lockhart Preston Gates Ellis LLP
55 Second Street, Suite 1700
San Francisco, CA 94105
Telephone: (415) 882-8200
Facsimile: (415) 882-8107